

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-13 are pending herein. Claims 1-12 have been amended to address matters of form and new claim 13 has been added in light of the changes to claim 7.

1. Claim 12 was rejected under §112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As disclosed on page 8, lines 34-36 of the present specification, a device according to an embodiment of the invention may include means that can sterilize the acquisition region after use. As disclosed on page 9, lines 1-4, the sterilization means may be an automatic system provided on the device to directly remove impurities from the acquisition region. As such, the sterilization means may be included as a portion of the device to automatically clean the acquisition region between users.

It is clear from the foregoing that claim 12 is supported by the original specification. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejection are respectfully requested.

2. Claims 1, 5, 6 and 8 were rejected under §102(b) over Waterbury, and claims 7 and 12 were rejected under §103(a) over Waterbury. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a device for analyzing the physicochemical properties of a cutaneous surface comprising, among other things, a set of sensors grouped and located in an acquisition region in front of which the cutaneous surface to be analyzed is intended to be placed. Advantageously, the device according to the invention allows the user to simultaneously determine a variety of different types of information relating to a particular region of his or her cutaneous surface (specification, page 3, lines 17-20). Since the sensors are grouped in a limited region, it is possible to obtain results representing the same region for all of the parameters being analyzed (specification, page 3, lines 28-30). This arrangement also makes it possible to acquire the set of parameters simultaneously (specification, page 3, lines 31-32).

Devices of the prior art, as discussed below, include only one sensor per device, and thus require the user to apply multiple sensors at different times to achieve a desired grouping of results.

Waterbury discloses a device having one radiation sensor 19 provided on a front surface of a watch, which is not in contact with the user's skin (Waterbury, Fig. 1 and column 7, lines 64-65), and a single sensor 22 located on a reverse side of the watch in contact with the user's skin (Waterbury, Fig. 2 and column 8, lines 26-34). Waterbury discloses in column 5, lines 10-16 that the sensor 22 is a sensor responsive to a physiological body variable such as galvanic skin potential, pH factor or body temperature. Waterbury further discloses in column 8, lines 26-34 that the sensor 22 may be a galvanic or moisture-sensitive device or any other electro-chemical element whose output depends on the varying characteristics of the skin. Waterbury does not disclose or suggest the addition of multiple sensors to be in contact with the user's skin. Therefore, Waterbury fails to disclose a device comprising a set of sensors grouped and located in an acquisition region in front of which the cutaneous surface to be analyzed is intended to be placed, as recited in claim 1. Since claims 5-8 and 12 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, those claims are also believed to be allowable over the applied prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

3. Claims 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9 were rejected under §102(b) over Yamazaki, and claims 7 and 12 were rejected under §103(a) over Yamazaki. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Yamazaki discloses in Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 33-34, an automatic system including various measuring apparatuses (1) to (7) that are used "as occasion calls." Yamazaki describes the function of each device in column 3, line 36 -- column 4, line 17. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Yamazaki that these individual devices are grouped together and located in a single acquisition region in front of which the user's cutaneous surface is intended to be placed. To the contrary, it appears that an

individual measuring apparatus of Yamazaki is used separately from other measuring apparatuses. Therefore, Yamazaki fails to disclose a device comprising a set of sensors grouped and located in an acquisition region in front of which the cutaneous surface to be analyzed is intended to be placed, as recited in claim 1. Since claims 2, 3, 7-9 and 12 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, those claims are also believed to be allowable over the applied prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully traversed.

4. Claim 4 was rejected under §103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Haddock. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments submitted above distinguish claim 1 from Yamazaki. Since Haddock does not overcome the deficiencies of Yamazaki, and since claim 4 depends directly from claim 1, claim 4 is also believed to be allowable over the applied prior art.

5. Claim 4 was rejected under §103(a) over Waterbury in view of Haddock. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments submitted above distinguish claim 1 from Waterbury. Since Haddock does not overcome the deficiencies of Waterbury, and since claim 4 depends directly from claim 1, claim 4 is also believed to be allowable over the applied prior art.

6. Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under §103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Ouellette. Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments submitted above distinguish claim 1 from Yamazaki. Since Ouellette does not overcome the deficiencies of Yamazaki, and since claims 10 and 11 depend directly from claim 1, those claims are also believed to be allowable over the applied prior art.


If the Examiner believes that contact with Applicants' attorney would be advantageous toward the disposition of this case, the Examiner is herein requested to call Applicants' attorney at the phone number noted below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1446.

Respectfully submitted,

November 8, 2006

Date



Stephen P. Burr

Reg. No. 32,970

Timothy D. Evans

Reg. No. 50,797

SPB/TE/tlp

BURR & BROWN

P.O. Box 7068

Syracuse, NY 13261-7068

Customer No.: 025191

Telephone: (315) 233-8300

Facsimile: (315) 233-8320